

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 10, 2010 and the Advisory Action dated June 1, 2010. Claims 1–6 and 8–10, 12, and 14–21 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 10, and 12 have been amended. Claims 11 and 13 have been canceled without prejudice and their subject matter has been added to claim 10. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection in view of the amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Preliminarily, Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's determination that claims 9, 13, and 19 include patentable subject matter, and further note the Examiner's allowance of claim 21. The Examiner objects to claims 9, 13, and 19 as depending from rejected base claims. Because Applicant believes that the base claims in this case are patentable for the reasons described below, it is respectfully asserted that this objection is moot.

Claims 1–6, 8, 10–12, 14–18, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0059434 to Karaoguz et al. (hereinafter "Karaoguz") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,903,832 to Seppanen et al. (hereinafter "Seppanen").

Claim 10 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 11 and 13. The Examiner has explicitly found the subject matter of claim 13 to be allowable. In reliance on the Examiner's statements, Applicants believe that claim 10 as amended is in condition for allowance.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that user operations are associated with a prioritized list of network types. This amendment is supported in the present specification at least in Table 1 and page 6, lines 2–5. The claim has been furthermore clarified to emphasize that the memory stores the list as being associated with operations, rather than associating operations with networks.

Claim 1 as amended recites, *inter alia*, "memory which stores information associating individual user operations with a prioritized list of network types." The feature of using a prioritized list of network types can also be found in claims 13 and 19. The Examiner has explicitly found these claims to include allowable subject matter. Indeed, both Karaoguz and Seppanen fail entirely to address the possibility of prioritizing associated network types.

Additionally, although a subtle point, Applicants believe that clarifying the claim

Ser. No. 140511,294

CUSTOMER NO. 24498

Amendment dated July 10, 2010

Reply to Office action of March 10, 2010

Reply to Advisory action of June 1, 2010

language to specify that network types are associated with individual user operations is pertinent. The Examiner asserts that Karaoguz teaches receiving information about networks "and their corresponding types of services for individual user operations, e.g., voice communications, data communications, etc., which can be performed on each network." Even assuming, *arguendo*, that the Examiner's interpretation of Karaoguz is accurate, it does not read on the present claims. At best Karaoguz lists a set of features of a network, but does not in any way disclose or suggest associating a network type with a user operation.

Seppanen cannot cure this deficiency, as it is introduced solely to show storing displaying messages from a memory. For at least the above reasons it is therefore respectfully asserted that Karaoguz and/or Seppanen, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest associating individual user operations with a prioritized list of network types.

It is therefore believed that claims 1 and 10 are in condition for allowance. Claims 2–6, 8–9, 12, and 14–20 depend from claims 1 and 10 and include all of the elements of their parent claims. It is therefore believed that all of claims 1–6 and 8–10, 12, and 14–20 are in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claim now pending in the application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

It is believed that no additional fees or charges are currently due. However, in the event that any additional fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the application, they may be charged to applicant's Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

Louis Robert Litwin

Date: 6-28-10
By: J. Hale
Jeffrey D. Hale
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 40,012

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312